APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/270,256	03/15/1999	ILYA KLEBANOV	0100.9900440	2265

24228   7590   09/03/2002

MARKISON & RECKAMP, PC
PO BOX 06229
WACKER DR
CHICAGO, IL 60606-0229

EXAMINER
YANG, RYAN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/270,256		KLEBANOV, ILYA
	Examiner		Art Unit
	Ryan R Yang		2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 July 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,14,15 and 19* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *5-13,16-18,20* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: .

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01)   **Office Action Summary**   Part of Paper No. 10

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 7/16/02.

This action is final.

2.   Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14 and 15 are independent ·

claims.

3.   The present title of the invention is "Method and Apparatus for Rendering an

Image in a Video Graphics Adapter" as filed originally.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

5.   Claims 1, 3-4, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated over Moncrief (5,275,565).

As per claim 1, Moncrief discloses a method of displaying active video on a

computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving at a first video graphics adapter (VGA) a first frame of active video from

a video source (Figure 3, "a master controller connected to said control input means,

said first memory, said maser controller generating signals to cause said first monitor to

display a first portion of said simulated space which is spatially congruent with said first

monitor", column 12, 63-68, where the master controller is a VGA);

rendering at least a first portion of the first frame of video at the first VGA in

response to a first control signal (Figure 4 112a); and

rendering at least a second portion of the first frame of video at a second VGA in

response to a second control signal (Figure 4 112b, "A slave controller connected to

said master controller, said second monitor and said second memory, said slave

controller generating signals based upon said reference signal from said master

controller and said data in said second memory to cause said second monitor to display

a second portion of said simulated space which is spatially congruent with said second

monitor", column 13, line 9-16).

6.   As per claim 3, Moncrief demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected

claim 1, supra, and further discloses the step of rendering at least a first portion of the

first frame video at the first VGA includes storing the at least a first portion of the active

video in a video memory associated with the first VGA (Figure 4 116a).

7.   As per claim 4, Moncrief demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected

claim 3, supra, and further discloses the step of rendering at least a second portion of

the first frame of video at the second VGA includes the substep of:

storing the at least second portion of the active video in a first video memory

associated with the first VGA (Figure 4 116b).

8.   As per claim 15, Moncrief discloses a method of displaying active video on a

computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving at a first video graphics adapter (VGA) a first frame of active video from

a video source (Figure 3, "a master controller connected to said control input means,

said first memory, said maser controller generating signals to cause said first monitor to

display a first portion of said simulated space which is spatially congruent with said first

monitor", column 12, 63-68, where the master controller is a VGA); and

displaying at least a first portion of the first frame of video at a second VGA in

response to a second control signal ("A slave controller connected to said master

controller, said second monitor and said second memory, said slave controller

generating signals based upon said reference signal from said master controller and

said data in said second memory to cause said second monitor to display a second

portion of said simulated space which is spatially congruent with said second monitor",

column 13, line 9-16).

9.   As per claim 19, Moncrief demonstrated all the elements as applied to the

rejected claim 15, supra, and further discloses the method further comprises storing the

first frame of active video in a video memory associated with the first VGA (Figure 4

116a).

10.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Broemmelsiek (5,574,836).

As per claim 14, Broemmelsiek discloses a processing system for executing

instructions, the processor system comprising instructions for:

monitoring the location of an active video window ("The microprocessor 52 then

determines the new coordinates of front object 80", column 8, line 33-34);

storing active video data at first video memory ("microprocessor 52 ... draws the

front object 80 into the first frame buffer unit 62a", column 6, line 58-60); and

sending the active video data from the first memory to a second memory when

the location of the active video window is associated with the second video memory

("and draws front object 80 into second frae buffer unit 62b in its coordinates in the

same way it was drawn into first frame buffer unit 62a", column 8, line 34-36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moncrief

(5,275,565).

As per claim 2, Moncrief demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected

claim 1, supra.

Since the first portion and the second portion are differ by a reference signal,

they could be the same.

Allowable Subject Matter

12.   Claims 5-13, 16-18 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

13.   Applicant's arguments filed 7/16/02 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

As per claim 1, applicant argues that Moncrief teaching does not teach that the

simulated space is a full frame of video where a first portion is provided on a first screen

and a second portion is provided on the second screen. This is not persuasive because

the panoramic view discloses by Moncrief can be considered a frame of video, thus, a

portion of which is provided to a first screen and a second portion is provided to a

second screen. Since the three monitors are used to display a panoramic view, the

views presented to each screen are interdependent. As for rendering, the process is

performed by generating polygons (Figure 4 112a, 112b).

As per claim 19, by considering the whole panoramic view as a frame of video, it

is clear the Master Controller met the limitation.

As per claim 14, applicant argues the monitoring process is a continuous

process, however, there is no limitation that a determining step cannot be a continuous

process. As for "sending the active video data from the first memory to a second

memory when the location of the active video window is associated with the second

video memory", by drawing front object 80 (which is considered an active window) into

second frame buffer unit 62b in its coordinates in the same way it was drawn into first

frame buffer unit 62a, the two are associated.

Conclusion

14.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiries

15.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to **Ryan Yang** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-**

6133.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, **Michael Razavi**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4713**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal

Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office

whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Ryan Yang
August 28, 2002

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600